

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I have received a number of motions for adjournment and call attention and also with regard to short-notice questions with regard to what has happened in Madhugiri. I feel that there is something that requires attention because the matter cannot be passed over. Therefore, what shall we do? It has to come before the House. I have been requesting Hon'ble Members concerned to apply their minds and tell me. In some shape or other the House must have a chance of dealing with it. It may be in the shape of call attention and a statement on that and a debate, in which case there will be no vote. If it is an adjournment motion, there will be voting. I mention this to both sides of the House—both the Opposition and the Government.

**Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.**—I have no objection to have a call attention motion Sir.

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—We have applied our mind. The point is, either by way of adjournment motion or if under rule 63 it is admitted, immediately you may be pleased to allot 2½ hours discussion under rule 59. One of these two things. This point has to be made very clear that after the statement is made, this House must have an opportunity to discuss the subject for 2½ hours as laid down under rule 59.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—If Conditions are going to be imposed it looks as if I am not functioning!

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—You will kindly bear with me for a minute Sir, We have our apprehensions, because normally whenever a statement is made under rule 63, the matter rests there. So far we have had no occasion and no discussion has taken place. May be, none of us has pressed it. One of these two things will satisfy us. Either by way of an adjournment motion—I think it would be most expeditious in view of the importance of the subject which has attracted the attention of the State. I am sure even some members on the other side of the House may be feeling the same. One of these two things we want: either an adjournment motion, or if in your wisdom if you feel that the adjournment motion is not proper, a call attention notice under rule 63, we may not have possibly any objection provided we have an opportunity to discuss it and express our verdict on the subject.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I must observe that whatever that might have been said, I am applying my mind to the importance of the subject. If, on the other hand, it is going to be stated “unless it is to be like this”, I will not be able to exercise all my discretion. If I am not to exercise discretion, members enforce their rights; I have no objection. I am trying to co-ordinate; I am struggling hard at it. If the Members will say “unless you are going to do this and impose conditions, to be used later in defence, we will be nowhere. This is an attitude which I would not relish and the House would not like.

**SRI K. H. PATIL** (Gadag).—It is no condition. Sri Siddaveerappa has appealed that on the adjournment motion, that condition will have to be withdrawn by us. He has said that the Speaker has got the discretion. He has addressed his appeal to all of us not to attach any condition. We want to be quite and calm but the situation does not allow us to be calm.

**MR. SPEAKER**.—I may tell this Hon'ble. Member now and once for all that if he gets up, I will have to take suitable action. Unless I call upon him by name, he should not speak. This is not a matter in which he should interfere off and on. When I am addressing the House, he is going on dinning something. Either they must pull me up or yield. Now the statement on the Call Attention Notice will be made. A discussion of 2½ hours will be allowed on it. No higgling and haggling and taking away the grace of doing it. The statement may be made.

† **SRI M. V. RAMA RAO** (Minister for Home and Labour).—No atrocities have been committed by Police in Madhugiri Taluk and no villagers have been illegally detained or inhumanly treated as alleged. On the contrary law breakers have had the hardihood to commit assault upon public servants after obstructing them in the performance of their official duties.

In exercise of powers conferred by Clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9 of Sugar Cane (Control) Order, 1966 read with G. S. R. 1127 dated 16th July, 1966 of the Government of India in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Community Development, the Government of Mysore have issued the Mysore Sugarcane (Regulation and Distribution) (Gowribidanur) Order in the year 1967 to enable the Co-operative Sugar Factory, Gowribidanur to secure the required quantity of Cane for crushing. According to this order sugarcane growers in the reserved area shall supply to the Factory 95 per cent of the Sugarcane grown by them. Further, under the Mysore Licensing Crushers Order of 1966 issued in exercise of the same power, no person shall, in any reserved area, work a power crusher or a Khandasari unit without a valid licence issued by the Deputy Commisniener. All officers of the Revenue Department not below the rank of a Tahsildar are empowered to make the power crushers inoperative in case any crusher is found working without a valid licence.

In order to enforce the order, on 30th November 1967 the Tahsildar, Madhugiri Taluk accompanied by the Sub-Inspector of police, Cane Supervisor and others visited Doddahosahalli, Thaggihalli Andralu and Hanumanthapura villages. In all these villages they found that a large number of sugarcane crushers were being operated without a licence in contravention of the order referred to. Therefore, the Tahsildar immobilised the crushers by taking out some parts and they were also seized under mahazars. They met with some resistance at Thaggihalli village. But when they were taking action in Hanumanthapura, a mob

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO)

collected and prevented the Revenue and Police authorities from proceeding with their work, surrounded the jeep, threatened the Tahsildar and the Police, tried to pull out the officers, assaulted the Tahsildar, Revenue Inspector, sub-Inspector of Police and the Cane Supervisor. However on the intervention of some local persons they were allowed to proceed. But some members of the mob snatched all the mahazars and records and the parts which had been seized, from the possession of the Tahsildar. A case in Crime No. 135/67 was registered for offences under Sections 143, 147, 148, 149, 323 and 395 I. P. C. of Kodigenahalli Police Station. The injured officials got themselves treated at Madhugiri.

On 1st December 1967, the Circle Inspector of Police, Madhugiri Circle having taken up investigation in Crime No. 135/67 proceeded to Hanumanthapura village along with the Sub-Inspector of Police, Kodigenahalli, Tahsildar, Revenue Inspector and Sugar-Cane Supervisor and staff. One of the accused was arrested by the Circle Inspector of Police. No sooner this was done, then a host of persons indulging in abusive language, demanded the release of the accused and threatened to use force. The mob damaged the Police Van, deflated the tyres, poured kerosine oil over tyres and were about to set fire to it, and set free the accused. In the meanwhile by about 12-30 p.m. the Deputy Superintendent of Police arrived at the spot but by then the mob numbered 1,000, and the officials were prevented from discharging their duty.

At about 4-30 p.m. some of the local people who arrived at the spot appealed to the mob not to indulge in lawlessness and came to the help of the officers. The Circle Inspector of Police later reached Kodigenahalli and registered a case in Kodigenahalli Police Station in Crime Nos. 135 and 136 of 67 under sections 143, 147, 148, 149, 323, 323 and 440 I. P. C.

On 2nd December 1967 in the early morning, the additional District Magistrate and Superintendent of Police, along with the staff, reached the village and arrested about 80 persons concerned in the above cases. Including the subsequent arrests made, the number so far arrested is 91. The situation is under control now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will have it cyclostyled and distributed. The matter is important and urgent. Either today or tomorrow, we shall take it up in consultation with the Leader of the House.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—It is according to the convenience of the House, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Tomorrow, as soon as Question Hour is over, we shall take it up and it will have precedence over all other business. 2½ hours will be allotted. I suggest that members may divide the time and co-ordinate and do not complicate the matters, and they may arrange

between themselves because there is no question of party in this. I only request the Whips to do so as they please and afterwards not blame me or the House for lack of co-ordination and complain that the time was not enough.

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—One clarification from the Hon'ble Minister. He was pleased to say that the Tahsildar immobilised these crushers. I want to know under what power or what order he did it.

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—The orders that were cited vest the power to immobilise an unlicensed sugar cane crusher.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Any way, I will try to get those copies and members must try to help themselves. If it is not in the library, we will try elsewhere.

### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

**Sri B. D. JATTI** (Minister for Food and Civil Supplies).—Sir, on behalf of the hon. Minister for Law. I beg to lay on the Table the authenticated copy of the Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly Constituencies Order 1966 under Section 8(2) of the Representation of the People Act, 1950.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The authenticated copy of the Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly Constituencies Order 1966 under Section 8 (2) of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, is laid.

### MYSORE VILLAGE OFFICES ABOLITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967

*Motion to Consider—(Debate Continued)*

AND

### NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTION *re*: DISAPPROVING THE MYSORE VILLAGE OFFICES ABOLITION (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE 1967.

†**Sri B. RACHAIAH** (Minister for Revenue and forests).—Sir, I am sorry yesterday there was some mistake in not appending the memorandum, regarding the delegated legislation. Now it is appended and circulated to the members and I hope the members will see that the Bill is pushed through.

The hon'ble members are aware that in 1961 the Mysore Village Offices Abolition Bill was enacted and it was given effect to from 1st February 1963.